

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 17, 2003, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 17, 2003. The allowability of claims 17-25, 27-35, 37-44 and 46-70 have been withdrawn by the Examiner. Claims 1, 7-8, 11, 17-18, 21, 24-26, 29, 31, 36, 45-48, 50-52, 54 and 65 have been amended to more clearly recite aspects of the invention. New claims 71-79 have been added to more clearly recite aspects of the invention. Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced by the amendments and the new claims presented herein. The amendments and the new claims have been made in a good faith effort to advance prosecution on the merits. Claims 30, 40 and 49 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to subsequently take up prosecution of the claims as originally filed in this application in a continuation, a continuation-in-part and/or a divisional application. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claim 1 is objected to for certain informalities. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite aspects of the invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,348,126 (*Hanawa*). *Hanawa* is generally directed to a plasma reactor for processing a workpiece. The reactor includes a chamber adapted to accept processing gases in an evacuated environment, including a workpiece support, a hollow conduit defining a wall of the chamber, respective ends opening adjacent opposite sides of the workpiece support, a chamber wall portion in facing relationship to the workpiece support, and a workpiece processing zone therebetween. The processing zone and the interior of the conduit form a torroidal interior path. The reactor further includes an RF energy applicator for irradiating gas within the chamber to maintain a plasma within the torroidal interior path. However, *Hanawa* does not address the problems encountered with processing large area substrates, such as how to deliver reactive species into a large area chamber and maintain plasma uniformity over the large area of flat panel displays, solar panels and the like. More specifically,

*Hanawa* does not teach or disclose a plasma shaping apparatus having one or more moveable portions for changing the geometry of the plasma shaping apparatus. Rather, *Hanawa* merely proposes inserting two cylindrical core pairs through coil windings and changing the displacement between two cylindrical core pairs to adjust the ion density near the wafer center relative to the ion density at the wafer circumference. *Hanawa* mentions nothing with respect to adjusting the geometry of the plasma shaping apparatus during processing. Accordingly, claims 1, 36 and 45 are patentable over *Hanawa*. Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-25, 36-39, 41-44, 46-48, 50-73 are also patentable over claim 1 since they depend from claims 1, 36 and 45, respectively.

*Hanawa* also does not teach or disclose the first plasma shaping apparatus and the second plasma shaping apparatus comprising at least one of magnets, permanent magnets, electromagnets and combinations thereof. Rather, *Hanawa* proposes a coil antenna disposed on one side of the hollow conduit and connected to an RF power source to generate a magnetic field. *Hanawa* mentions nothing about having a plasma shaping apparatus that includes magnets, permanent magnets, or electromagnets. Accordingly, claims 26 and 74 are patentable over *Hanawa*. Claims 27-35 and 75 are patentable over *Hanawa* since they depend from claims 26 and 74, respectively.

The Examiner has rejected various dependent claims. However, because the rejections to the respective base claims have been overcome, Applicants submit that the rejections for the dependent claims have been obviated.

With regard to new claims 71-79, Applicants submit that claims 71-79 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed, taught, nor otherwise suggested by the cited references, and as such, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed method or apparatus. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

The prior art made of record is noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, it is believed that a detailed discussion

of the secondary references is not deemed necessary for a full and complete response to this office action. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Ari Pramudji

Registration No. 45,022

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicant(s)